UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,012	04/12/2007	Peter J. Ford	061608-0380	4803

30542   7590   11/10/2009

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
P.O. BOX 80278
SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278

EXAMINER
XAVIER, ANTONIO J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,012	FORD ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANTONIO XAVIER	2629	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2006*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 June 2006* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/21/06*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1-6, 13-17, 20, 24-27 and 32 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

      a.   Claim 1 is a method claim reciting structural limitations via means for

language. Examiner notes patentable weight is not being given to the structural

limitations of the means for language and suggests removing the limitation from

the claim. Examiner suggests using step for language if Applicant wants to

invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph for a method;

      b.   Claims 2-6 are dependent on Claim 1 and objected to for substantially the

same reasons;

      c.   Claim 13 is a method claim reciting structural limitations via means for

language in the preamble. Examiner notes patentable weight is not being given

to the structural limitations of the means for language and suggests removing the

limitation from the preamble of the claim. Examiner suggests using step for

language if Applicant wants to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph for a

method;

      d.   Claims 12-17 are dependent on Claim 13 and objected to for substantially

the same reasons;

e.   Claim 20 is a device reciting "wherein the second selection means comprises a <u>character prediction engine</u>" (emphasis added). Examiner notes the limitation does not appear to further define the structure associated with the second selection means. Examiner suggests changing the claim to read on the processing means based on paragraph [0057] of the specification as filed;

f.   Claim 24 is a method claim reciting structural limitations via means for language in the preamble. Examiner notes patentable weight is not being given to the structural limitations of the means for language and suggests removing the limitation from the preamble of the claim. Examiner suggests using step for language if Applicant wants to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph for a method;

g.   Claims 25-27 are dependent on Claim 24 and objected to for substantially the same reasons; and

h.   Claim 32 is a device reciting "wherein the second selection means comprises a <u>character prediction engine</u>" (emphasis added). Examiner notes the limitation does not appear to further define the structure associated with the second selection means. Examiner suggests changing the claim to read on the processing means based on paragraph [0057] of the specification as filed.

Appropriate correction is required.

35 USC § 112

Examiner notes that the following limitations are being treated as <u>proper</u>

<u>invocations</u> of means plus function language under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph:

(1) "determining means" (Claim 7);

(2) "scrolling means" (Claim 7);

(3) "selection means" (Claim 7);

(4) "scrolling means" (Claim 18);

(5) "first selection means" (Claim 18);

(6) "second selection means" (Claim 18);

(7) "processing means" (Claim 18);

(8) "scrolling means" (Claim 28);

(9) "first selection means" (Claim 28);

(10) "second selection means" (Claim 28); and

(11) "determining means" (Claim 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-3 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Will (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,392,640).

With respect to Claim 1, Will teaches a method for enabling a user to enter data

into an electronic device (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the method

comprising:

determining one or more characters as being likely to be selected next by the

user (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 12, line 30-Col. 13, line 45

teach a text prediction system);

displaying the one or more characters on a display screen of the electronic

device as suggested next characters (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and

Col. 6, line 16-Col. 7, line 35 teach displaying the predicted words in order of

frequency); and

providing the user with means for scrolling through the suggested next

characters (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 6, line 12

teach scrolling through the list/characters using a thumbwheel. Examiner notes

patentable weight is not being given to the structural limitations of the means for

language) and a plurality of other symbols (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15

and Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 7, lines 30-65. Examiner is broadly interpreting the

term "symbol" to include "[SP]" representing the concept of a space and "[BS]"

representing the concept of a backspace as well as other menu items allowing the user

to launch a full alphabetic keyboard or exit out of the current application) and selecting

one or more of the suggested next characters, or alternatively one or more of the other

symbols, as data to be entered into the electronic device (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B

and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20 teach using the thumbwheel to select the

predicted word or symbols).

With respect to Claim 2, Will teaches a method according to claim 1, discussed

above, wherein the one or more characters or symbols selected by the user are

displayed on the display screen (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 6,

lines 16-35 and Col. 7, lines 2-5 teach that when a user selects characters using the

predictive text system the selected characters are subsequently displayed).

With respect to Claim 3, Will teaches a method according to claim 1, discussed

above, wherein the determining step comprises predicting which characters are

statistically the most likely to be selected next by the user (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-

10B and 12A-15 and Col. 6, lines 60-62 and Col. 12, lines 30-49 teach frequency of use

is used by the predictive text system. Examiner notes Will also teaches identifying the

suggested words/characters by placing them in order of frequency).

With respect to Claim 24, Will teaches a method of entering data into an

electronic device (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the device comprising

scrolling means and selection means (Examiner is not giving patentable weight to

structural limitations recited in a method claim) and the method comprising:

scrolling, by the scrolling means, through a plurality of logically arranged groups

of symbols, so as to indicate one of the groups (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-

15 and Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20);

selecting, by the selection means, an indicated group of symbols (Figs. 1A-1C,

4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20); and

selecting one of the symbols from the selected group as data to be entered into

the device (Figs. 14A-15 and Col. 14, line 1-Col. 15, line 62 teach disambiguation of a

previously selected character group).

With respect to Claim 25, Will teaches a method according to claim 24,

discussed above, further comprising the steps of:

subsequently determining, by means of a computer program within the device,

one or more symbols as being likely to be selected next by a user (Figs. 14A-15 and

Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 14, line 1-Col. 15, line 62 teach disambiguation of a

previously selected character group. Examiner notes the character disambiguation is

performed in conjunction with the text prediction engine to reduce the number of

predictions. For example, based on Fig. 14A, disambiguation of the first character by

selecting the letter "p" would eliminate potential predictions, such as "tin" and "sin" and

determine one or more symbols as being likely to be selected next by a user); and

displaying the one or more symbols on a display screen of the electronic device

as suggested next symbols (Figs. 14A-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 4-23 and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Will (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,392,640).

With respect to Claim 4, Will teaches a method according to claim 1, discussed

above, wherein the plurality of other symbols are adapted to perform a function on

selection by a user (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 7, lines 30-65.

Examiner is broadly interpreting the term "function" as including, but not limited to,

adding a space, backspacing, opening a full alphabetic keyboard, exiting out of the

current mode of the application, or changing the mode of operation of the device).

However, Will fails to expressly teach wherein the plurality of other symbols

includes one or more <u>icons</u> which are adapted to perform a function on selection by a

user (Examiner notes he is interpreting the limitation "icon" as a more specific form of

"symbol" with regards to user interfaces. Specifically, the limitation "icon" requires some

type of graphical symbol/representation) (emphasis added).

Examiner takes official notice that icons are well known in the art. It would have

been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute an icon for the symbols

adapted to perform a function on selection of Will. One would be motivated to make this

change of user interface representation because both symbols and icons were known in

the art and the results of the substitution of one for the other would have been

predictable.

With respect to Claim 5, Will teaches a method according to claim 1, discussed

above, wherein the scrolling and selecting steps are carried out on a handheld

electronic device comprising scrolling means and selection means, wherein the scrolling

means and the selection means are provided by a cylindrical input mechanism, and

scrolling can be achieved by rotating the input mechanism about its axis (Figs. 1A-1C,

4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 11, lines 10-15 teach the use of a thumbwheel or

jog-shuttle. Both the thumbwheel and jog-shuttle provide scrolling input when rotated

about their axis. Examiner notes patentable weight is not being given to the structural

limitations of the means for language).

However, Will fails to expressly teach wherein the scrolling and selecting steps

are carried out on a handheld electronic device comprising scrolling means and

selection means, wherein the scrolling means and the selection means are provided by

a cylindrical input mechanism, and scrolling can be achieved by rotating the input

mechanism about its axis and <u>selection can be achieved by pushing the input</u>

<u>mechanism along its axis</u> (emphasis added).

Examiner takes official notice that cylindrical input devices that rotate about their

axis and provide a selection input when pushed along its axis downwards towards the

housing are well known in the art (hereinafter referred to as a "rotary input device"). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a rotary input device for the thumbwheel of Will providing the user with means for scrolling through the suggested next characters and a plurality of other symbols and selecting one or more of the suggested next characters, or alternatively one or more of the other symbols, as data to be entered into the electronic device. One would be motivated to make this change of input device because both input devices were known in the art and the results of the substitution of one for the other would have been predictable.

With respect to Claim 6. Will teaches a method according to claim 1, discussed above. However, Will fails to expressly teach wherein the plurality of other symbols comprises characters grouped as on an ITU-T keypad.

Examiner takes official notice that ITU-T keypad layouts are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the symbol and character groupings of an ITU-T keypad for the symbol and character groupings of Will. One would be motivated to make this change of interface layout because both layouts/groupings were known in the art and the results of the substitution of one for the other would have been predictable. Furthermore, Examiner notes that Will suggests alternative groupings are possible, including those taught by standard telephone keypads (Col. 10, lines 11-12).

With respect to Claim 7, Will teaches an electronic device into which a user can enter data (Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the device comprising:

determining means for determining one or more characters as being likely to be selected next by the user when the device is in a data entry mode (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 12, line 30-Col. 13, line 45 teach a text prediction system);

a display screen for displaying the one or more characters as suggested next characters (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 6, line 16-Col. 7, line 35 teach displaying the predicted words in order of frequency);

scrolling input allowing the user to scroll through the suggested next characters (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 6, line 12 teach scrolling through the list/characters using a thumbwheel) and a plurality of other symbols (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 7, line 30-65. Examiner is broadly interpreting the term "symbol" to include "[SP]" representing the concept of a space and "[BS]" representing the concept of a backspace as well as other menu items allowing the user to launch a full alphabetic keyboard or exit out of the current application); and

selection means allowing the user to select one or more of the suggested next characters, or alternatively one or more other symbols, as data to be entered into the electronic device (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20 teach using the thumbwheel to select the predicted word or symbols).

However, Will fails to expressly teach the <u>specific means for scrolling and</u>

<u>selecting described in the specification as filed</u> (emphasis added). Specifically, Will fails

to describe a rotary mechanism that can be pressed downwards, in the direction

towards the handset by pushing along its axis (Examiner notes the specific structure

described in Figs. 2A-2B can be distinguished from the thumbwheel input taught by

Will).

Examiner takes official notice that input devices that rotate about their axis and

provide a selection input when pushed along its axis downwards towards the housing

are well known in the art (rotary input device). It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art to substitute a rotary input device for the thumbwheel of Will

providing the user with means for scrolling through the suggested next characters and a

plurality of other symbols and selecting one or more of the suggested next characters,

or alternatively one or more of the other symbols, as data to be entered into the

electronic device. One would be motivated to make this change of input device

because both input devices were known in the art and the results of the substitution of

one for the other would have been predictable.

The further limitations of Claims 8-12 are rejected for substantially the same

reasons as Claims 2-6, discussed above.

With respect to Claim 13, Will teaches a method of entering data into an

electronic device (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the device comprising

scrolling means and selection means (Examiner is not giving patentable weight to

structural limitations recited in a method claim) and the method comprising:

scrolling, by the scrolling means, through a plurality of groups of symbols, so as

to indicate one of the groups (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 2,

lines 59-64 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20);

selecting, by the selection means, an indicated group of symbols (Figs. 1A-1C,

4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20);

selecting one of the symbols of the selected group as data to be entered into the

device (Figs. 14A-15 and Col. 14, line 1-Col. 15, line 62 teach disambiguation of a

previously selected character group); and

processing the selected symbol as an entered symbol (Figs. 14A-15. Although

Will fails to expressly teach processing the selected symbol as an entered symbol,

Examiner notes the processing is inherently performed in a system asking the for

specific disambiguation input).

However, Will fails to expressly teach the symbols comprising characters

grouped as on an ITU-T keypad (emphasis added)

Examiner takes official notice that ITU-T keypad layouts are well known in the

art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the

symbol and character groupings of an ITU-T keypad for the symbol and character

groupings of Will. One would be motivated to make this change of interface layout

because both layouts/groupings were known in the art and the results of the substitution

of one for the other would have been predictable. Furthermore, Examiner notes that

Will suggests alternative groupings are possible, including those taught by standard

telephone keypads (Col. 10, lines 11-12).

With respect to Claim 14, Will teaches a method according to claim 13,

discussed above, wherein the selected symbol is selected from the selected group by

the selection means (Figs. 14A-15 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20 and Col. 14, lines

20-30 teach the disambiguated symbol is selected by the user. Examiner is not giving

patentable weight to structural limitations recited in a method claim).

With respect to Claim 15, Will teaches a method according to claim 13,

discussed above wherein the selected symbol is selected from the selected group by a

character prediction engine (Figs. 14A-15 and Col. 14, line 1-Col. 15, line 62 teach

disambiguation of a previously selected character group. Examiner notes the character

disambiguation is performed by the text prediction engine).

The further limitations of Claims 16-17 are rejected for substantially the same

reasons as Claims 4-5, discussed above.

With respect to Claim 18, Will teaches an electronic device into which a user can

enter data (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the device comprising:

scrolling means for allowing the user to scroll through a plurality of groups of

symbols, so as to indicate one of the groups (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15

and Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20 teach a cylindrical rotary input

device for scrolling); and

processing means for processing the selected symbols as an entered symbol

(Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15. Examiner notes Will teaches a text prediction

system using a combination of hardware and software to process selected symbols and

provide character disambiguation).

However, Will fails to expressly teach the symbols comprising characters

grouped as on an ITU-T keypad (emphasis added)

Examiner takes official notice that ITU-T keypad layouts are well known in the

art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the

symbol and character groupings of an ITU-T keypad for the symbol and character

groupings of Will. One would be motivated to make this change of interface layout

because both layouts/groupings were known in the art and the results of the substitution

of one for the other would have been predictable. Furthermore, Examiner notes that

Will suggests alternative groupings are possible, including those taught by standard

telephone keypads (Col. 10, lines 11-12).

Will in light of official notice teach an electronic device with text prediction using

an ITU-T character grouping. However, Will in light of official notice fails to specifically

teach the first and second selection means described in the specification as filed

(emphasis added). Specifically, Will in light of official notice fails to describe a rotary

mechanism that can be pressed downwards, in the direction towards the handset by

pushing along its axis (Examiner notes the specific structure described in Figs. 2A-2B can be distinguished from the thumbwheel input taught by Will).

Examiner takes official notice that input devices that rotate about their axis and provide a selection input when pushed along its axis downwards towards the housing are well known in the art (rotary input device). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a rotary input device for the thumbwheel of Will providing the user with selection means allowing the user to select one of the indicated groups of symbols and selecting one of the symbols from the selected group as data to be entered. One would be motivated to make this change of input device because both input devices were known in the art and the results of the substitution of one for the other would have been predictable.

With respect to Claim 19, Will teaches an electronic device according to claim 18, discussed above, wherein the second selection means is provided by the same mechanism as the first selection means (Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15. As discussed above, a rotary input device is used by Will to make selections in a character prediction system as well as the character disambiguation system).

With respect to Claim 20, Will teaches an electronic device according to claim 18, discussed above, wherein the second selection means comprises a character prediction engine (Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15. As discussed above, Examiner notes the limitation does not appear to further define the structure associated with the second

selection means. However, as discussed above, Will does teach a rotary input device is used in conjunction with a character prediction engine to make selections in a character prediction system as well as the character disambiguation system).

The further limitations of Claims 21-22 are rejected for substantially the same reasons as Claims 4-5, discussed above.

With respect to Claim 23, Will teaches an electronic device according to claim 22, discussed above, wherein the second selection means is provided by the cylindrical input mechanism (Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15. As discussed above, a rotary input device is used by Will to make selections in a character prediction system as well as the character disambiguation system).

The further limitations of Claims 26-27 are rejected for substantially the same reasons as Claims 6 and 4, discussed above.

With respect to Claim 28, Will teaches an electronic device into which a user can enter data (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15), the device comprising:

scrolling means for allowing the user to scroll through a plurality of logically arranged groups of symbols so as to indicate one of the groups (Figs. 1A-1C, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 2, lines 59-64 and Col. 5, line 65-Col. 7, line 20 teach a cylindrical rotary input device for scrolling);

However, Will fails to specifically teach the <u>first and second selection means described in the specification as filed</u> (emphasis added). Specifically, Will in light of official notice fails to describe a rotary mechanism that can be pressed downwards, in the direction towards the handset by pushing along its axis (Examiner notes the specific structure described in Figs. 2A-2B can be distinguished from the thumbwheel input taught by Will).

Examiner takes official notice that input devices that rotate about their axis and provide a selection input when pushed along its axis downwards towards the housing are well known in the art (rotary input device). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a rotary input device for the thumbwheel of Will providing the user with selection means allowing the user to select one of the indicated groups of symbols and selecting one of the symbols from the selected group as data to be entered. One would be motivated to make this change of input device because both input devices were known in the art and the results of the substitution of one for the other would have been predictable.

With respect to Claim 29, Will teaches an electronic device according to claim 28, discussed above, further comprising:

determining means for determining one or more symbols as being likely to be selected next by the user Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 12, line 30-Col. 13, line 45 teach a text prediction system. Examiner notes Will teaches a text

prediction system using a combination of hardware and software to process selected

symbols, determine text predictions and provide character disambiguation); and

a display screen for displaying the one or more symbols as suggested next

symbols (Figs. 1A-2, 4A-7B, 10A-10B and 12A-15 and Col. 8, lines 17-20 teach a

display screen for displaying).

The further limitations of Claims 30-33 are rejected for substantially the same

reasons as Claims 6, 19, 20 and 4, discussed above.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Silfverberg et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: 2005/0041011) and Yokoji et al.

(U.S. Pat. No.: 6,396,006) teach a rotary input device. Yamagishi et al. (U.S. Pat. No.:

6,178,338) teaches a scroll wheel selecting different functions from a list. Griffin

(WO03/056784) teaches the combination of alphanumeric characters and functions

provided by the same input.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ANTONIO XAVIER whose telephone number is 571-

270-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30am-4:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. X./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
                                    /Amare Mengistu/
                        Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629